IRELAND.

EARL FITZWILLIAM's LETTERS AND ADMINISTRATION RESCUED FROM MISREPRESENTATION.

WITH

SOME OBSERVATIONS

ON

A PAMPHLET

INTITLED

THE FAIR STATEMENT.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR G. KEARSLEY, NO. 46, FLEET-STREET.
1795.

THE

ADMINISTRATION AND LETTERS

OF

EARL FITZWILLIAM

RESCUED

From Miſrepreſentation, &c.

IT is on his conduct that Lord Fitzwilliam relies for the approbation of his countrymen; it is their verdict that muſt ſtamp or condemn his character; yet, while that verdict remains in ſuſpenſe, until an opportunity is allowed him of publicly vindicating his honour before the tribunal of his peers, his friends cannot behold, without an honeſt indignation, the artifices that have been deſcend-

ed to, to diſtort his expreſſions and to darken his faireſt actions.

The injurious attacks that have been made by the daily prints on the late lord lieutenant of Ireland, might have been paſſed over in contemptuous ſilence; but when a pamphlet, which is generally attributed to a member of the Iriſh commons, recently diſmiſſed from office, and which teems with the moſt indecent invective and the moſt wanton miſrepreſentation, is induſtriouſly circulated, a ſacred regard to truth and juſtice demands that its malignant tendency ſhould be expoſed, and its falſehoods refuted.

And ſuch, I may venture to aſſert, are the features of that pamphlet, which has been uſhered into the world, under the title of A *fair Statement of the Adminiſtration of Earl Fitzwilliam in Ireland.* The language and ſentiments ſufficiently proclaim the character and the condition of the author: that

ſoreneſs

ſoreneſs at the removals, that inceſſant ſtrain of arrogance and perſonal reſentment, mark the pen of a man, *whoſe tone and ſtyle, rendering his approach to a ſuperior not to be ſupported*, had diſmiſſed him to a private ſtation.

Without however waſting any further time in tracing the name and motives of the parent of this ſplenetic effuſion, let us proceed to examine how far this publication can claim the title of a *fair* ſtatement; and it is on the very firſt paragraph that I reſt my enquiry. "*Lord Fitzwilliam*," ſays he, "*firſt* "*ſuppoſes all his diſmiſſals and meaſures, (but* "*particularly his conduct on the Catholic* "*queſtion) to be the grounds of his recal*;" *he then aſſerts that the Catholic queſtion has nothing to do with it*; *and that the diſmiſſal of Mr. Beresford is alone the real cauſe of his diſgrace*; *laſtly he rejects theſe grounds altogether, and aſcribes his removal to an original determi-*

nation

nation in Mr. Pitt, at the time of the coalition, to diſcredit him and his friends.

What are the expreſſions of Lord Fitzwilliam, on which is grounded ſo falſe and ſo injurious a ſtatement? That nobleman has indeed, in that manly warmth which an upright heart feels from becoming the victim of dark and diſhoneſt intrigue, ſubmitted his *ſentiments* and his *ſuſpicions* to the public. He has aſſerted, in the moſt unequivocal terms, 1ſt, *that he does not believe the Catholic queſtion to have been the occaſion of his recal*, though it has been uſed with the people at large as a pretext for that extraordinary ſtep; 2dly, *that he does not conſider the diſmiſſals as the ſource of his diſgrace*, though they may have been employed to enſnare the judgment of part of the cabinet to an approbation of that meaſure; 3dly, *but that he ſuſpects the whole to have originated in the early determination of Mr. P—-, to diſunite*

and

and degrade the characters with whom he had affected to coaleſce; and for which purpoſe he has been vigilant to embrace every opportunity, and dexterous to avail himſelf of every engine.

It is an honourable ardour to reſcue his character from ſuch a degradation, that has called from Lord Fitzwilliam that defence in which, according to the author of the ſtatement, he *has revealed the ſecrets of his ſovereign, and has diſcloſed the confidential correſpondence of the cabinet.*

And what are the ſecrets that he has revealed; what is the confidential correſpondence that he has diſcloſed, for which he is thus ſeverely arraigned and condemned, as wholly unpardonable?

To betray, in a moment of intemperate reſentment, thoſe counſels on which perhaps the fate of an empire depends, to diſcloſe projects not yet ripe for execution, and the

ſucceſs

ſucceſs of which is blended with the ſilence that they are involved in, would be a crime of ſuch magnitude, as ſcarcely to be palliated, and certainly not be vindicated, by all that accumulated duplicity and defamation which integrity and independence can experience from miniſterial cunning and perſecution. But can Lord Fitzwilliam be accuſed of acting thus; and what are the dangers ariſing from any diſcloſure that he has made? what enemy has been invited? what enterpriſe fruſtrated? what hazard incurred? unleſs indeed it may be urged, that to queſtion the veracity and ability of miniſters, to expoſe their perfidy and nakedneſs, is to render Great Britain the object of diſtruſt and contempt to the ſurrounding nations. Alas, I fear even this plea miniſters themſelves have precluded; for whether we direct our ſteps to the courts of Madrid or Vienna; whether we conſult the unhappy royaliſts of France, or the fugitive partiſans

ſans of the Houſe of Orange, we ſhall find but one idea pervade the whole; one ſentiment of mingled ſurpriſe and ſcorn; one univerſal opinion of inſincerity, irreſolution, and inactivity. Embarked in a great and glorious cauſe, we have conducted it by petty and partial means; and inſtead of extending our views to the various ſtates of Europe, we have confined them to majorities in our houſes of parliament. Is it not the general reproach, that we are more ſolicitous to replace diſcarded adherents, than to re-eſtabliſh monarchy; and that, while our whole attention ought to be directed to cement our alliances abroad, we are ſolely occupied in undermining and debaſing our colleagues at home.

Theſe are not indeed the charges of Lord Fitzwilliam againſt the Britiſh cabinet: it is to defend his own honour, and not with a wiſh to criminate any man that he ſtands forward. Such is the nature of the tranſaction, that

blame muſt attach ſomewhere; a candid and public enquiry is all that he aſks; he laments that his own reputation cannot be cleared without endangering that of others; but where character is at ſtake, he rejects all compromiſe; the ornament of a ribbon, the title of a marquis might ſeem to convey his ſovereign's approbation of his conduct, but would only debaſe him in his own eyes, and in thoſe of his countrymen. His veracity and his honour, as a gentleman and a peer, are at iſſue; and, in ſupport of thoſe, he challenges an open and impartial ſcrutiny.

And in provoking this ſcrutiny, in ſubmitting his conduct to the tribunal of his countrymen, *where is this alarming breach of official confidence*, on which the author of the *Fair Statement* ſo perſeveringly dwells? Long previous to the publication of the letters to Lord Carliſle, had not the miniſterial prints received the ſignal for hoſtility and detraction?

was

was not Lord Fitzwilliam continually repreſented as a raſh and impracticable man, who, contrary to the inſtructions of his colleagues, was urging on the queſtion of Catholic emancipation? Was not this the daily language of the *True Briton*, and was it not re-echoed in the *Sun?* and will Mr. Burges deny his intereſt in the firſt paper, or Mr. Roſe his influence over the laſt? was it expected that Lord Fitzwilliam ſhould ſilently acquieſce under this load of odium and defamation? If ſuch was the wiſh of Mr. P—, he ſhould have recommended, for lord lieutetenant, ſome eaſy and ſubſervient character, who, early initiated to the emoluments of place, and trained to regard his patron as the wonder and oracle of the age, would have received his intimations as commands, would have preferred obedience before reputation, profit above honour; and who, having been accuſtomed invariably to adopt the ſenti-

ments of others, would never have been guilty of the preſumption of thinking for himſelf. Such a man, we are now convinced, might eaſily have been found; but it was not in the heir of the late Marquis of Rockingham that ſuch a man ſhould have been looked for.

Having thus diſmiſſed this weighty accuſation againſt Earl Fitzwilliam, of having diſcloſed the confidential correſpondence of the cabinet, let us candidly examine, 1ſt, How far the correſpondence that he has revealed tends, as the author of the *Fair* Statement aſſerts, to condemn him; and how far the ſupport that he has given to Catholic emancipation, can be conſiſtently and honeſtly urged as the occaſion of his recal.

Lord Fitzwilliam ſtates, *that previous to his departure for Ireland, Mr. P—, the duke of P---d, and the cabinet, were impreſſed with a conviction, that the work which was left imperfect in* 1793, *ought to be completed; and the Catholics*

relieved

relieved from every remaining diſqualification. Had Lord Fitzwilliam found it otherwiſe he never would have undertaken the government; that he propoſed himſelf that the additional indulgences ſhould be offered from the throne. To this propoſal objections were ſtated, which induced the adoption of another plan; and that he conſented not to bring the queſtion forward on the part of government, but rather to endeavour to keep it back, until a period of more general tranquillity, when ſo many material objects might not preſs upon government; but as the principle was agreed on, if the Catholics were determined to bring the buſineſs before parliament, he was to give it an handſome ſupport on the part of government.

Obſerve what form and ſenſe theſe declarations are taught by the author of the Fair Statement to aſſume. *Lord Fitzwilliam conſented not to bring forward the ſubject, but rather to endeavour to keep it back until a pe-*

riod of more general tranquillity, when ſo many material objects might not preſs upon government. Every word is carefully avoided, every ſyllable is ſtudiouſly ſuppreſſed, of his determination to ſupport this queſtion, in caſe the Catholics were themſelves reſolved to agitate it; and it is by ſuch omiſſions that the letters of Lord Fitzwilliam may be diſtorted to *condemn* his meaſures; and by ſuch omiſſions the decalogue may be tortured to authorize every crime that it is framed to prohibit.

The next obſervation that we find in the Fair Statement, is, *that Mr. Gratton, the confidential miniſter of Earl Fitzwilliam, had, on the 15th of December, ſettled with Mr. Byrne and the Catholic Body to come forward with petitions to parliament, and that Lord Fitzwilliam muſt have known what had paſſed in Ireland before he left London, which was not till the laſt day of the year.*

And

And who has taught this writer to aſſume the poſition of Mr. Grattan being the confidential miniſter of Earl Fitzwilliam. Mr. Grattan, the leader of a conſiderable party in Ireland, and the moſt eloquent member of the commons, was willing to give every aid to the adminiſtration of the viceroy, on the condition that he himſelf was ſupported in one grand meaſure, which he conſidered as eſſential to the tranquillity and proſperity of the country, the emancipation of the Catholics. To this he had already pledged himſelf; and, were this eluded or reſiſted, a concern for his own reputation compelled him to a direct and unequivocal oppoſition. That unity which it is pretended was the object of the coalition with the P——d party, would have been immediately extinguiſhed; and the clamours of the multitude without doors would have been echoed within by the ableſt orator that his country had ever given birth to.

Could

Could Mr. Grattan be confounded in the dependent creature of Lord Fitzwilliam, prompt to promote or renounce every project at his nod, then the charges of the author of the *Fair Statement* would be erected on ſome foundation; and the deſigns of Mr. Grattan might implicate alſo the late Lord Lieutenant.

But *Lord Fitzwilliam muſt have known what had been ſettled in Ireland between Mr. Grattan, and Mr. Byrne, before he left London*; and if Lord Fitzwilliam was acquainted with theſe proceedings, ſurely the reſt of the cabinet could not be ignorant of them. Was Mr. P-t, was the duke of P——d unacquainted with theſe reſolutions? and, if they were acquainted with them, why did they ſuffer Lord Fitzwilliam to depart without warning him againſt confiding in a man who was committed on meaſures, which they conſidered, if immediately carried into execu-

tion,

tion, of ſuch deſperate conſequences to the empire. They ſhould have broken in upon his moſt ſacred retirement; they ſhould have ſtopped him even at the moment that he was aſcending his chaiſe; they ſhould have conjured, they ſhould have remonſtrated, they ſhould have commanded.

Yet mark the plain fact. Without a ſingle word of expoſtulation, though in full poſſeſſion of this knowledge, they ſuffered the noble earl to depart, to throw himſelf into the arms of men, who were already pledged to meaſures, the reſult of which they now affect ſo loudly to deprecate; into the arms of men with whom they had in England recently held repeated converſations reſpecting thoſe very meaſures; whoſe ſentiments in favour of the Catholics they were thoroughly converſant with, and had approved; and on whoſe parliamentary talents, and public eſtimation, they well knew the popularity of

the

the viceroy's adminiſtration was in a conſi-derable degree to be founded.

What blame then can, on this occaſion, be fixed on Lord Fitzwilliam, which does not, in the ſame, or even a greater extent, attach to the majority of the cabinet? For whether the latter were unacquainted with thoſe proceedings in Ireland, which, it is aſſerted, were known to Lord Fitzwilliam; whether, being acquainted with them, they were too ſupine to make them the ſubject of immediate deliberation; or whether, knowing them, and determined to reſiſt them, they permitted the viceroy to embark, under the illuſion that they would ſupport them, they ſtand convicted by the *Fair Statement* of their own adherents, of ignorance, of negligence, or of duplicity.

Attend again to the *candour*, to the *ingenuouſneſs*, of the author of the *Fair Statement*. *Lord F. in his diſpatch of the 8th of January ſtates*,

ſtates, " *that he ſhould immediately uſe every* " *effort to keep back the Catholic queſtion.*" *The cabinet of courſe conceived that his lordſhip was ſincere and determined; they felt perhaps confident, that if his lordſhip exerted himſelf according to his promiſe, he would have been ſucceſsful, and of courſe due credit is given to his lordſhip, and no anſwer is returned to a letter which did not require one.*

Let us turn to the ſecond letter of Earl Fitzwilliam. " As early as the 8th of January," ſays that nobleman, " I wrote to the Se- " cretary of State, and told him, *that I trem-* " *bled about the Catholics; that I had great* " *fears about keeping them quiet for the ſeſſion;* " *that the queſtion was already in agitation.*" And is this the letter that required no anſwer? is this the letter that inſpired miniſters with ſuch *juſt* confidence, that they ſhould be able to defer what they were finally determined to execute? And is their miſerable apologiſt re-

duced to ſuch artifices; is it to ſuch groſs miſrepreſentations, to ſuch ſhameleſs omiſſions, that he is compelled to have recourſe? But let me warn him that his arguments will not be adopted by his employers. They know too well their own weakneſs to meet the adverſary that braves them. They will ſhelter themſelves behind the prerogative of the ſovereign; involved in ſilence, enſhrouded in darkneſs, they will pertinaciouſly elude every motion for enquiry; and, ſecure in the ſanctity of their retreat, they will purſue and mangle, by their hireling aſſaſſins, a reputation which they have not the temerity openly to encounter.

We will now proceed to examine the next charge. By a diſpatch of the 8th of February, Lord Fitzwilliam is acquainted *that his putting off the Catholic queſtion until the peace, may be of more eſſential ſervice, than any act of any miniſter ſince the Revolution, at leaſt ſince*

the

the Union. And what is the anſwer of the noble earl that appears ſo criminal in the eyes of the author of the Fair Statement? he *expreſſes his ſurpriſe at being now* preſſed, *for the firſt time, to defer the queſtion.* Can any thing place this tranſaction in a clearer light than the two letters thus alluded to? Does that of the ſecretary of ſtate convey a ſingle inſinuation of ſtipulations departed from, of engagements violated? And how could Lord Fitzwilliam have the aſſurance to expreſs his *ſurpriſe* at being, for the *firſt* time, *preſſed* to defer a queſtion, which he was conſcious that he had ſolemnly bound himſelf to delay, to the very perſon to whom he was then addreſſing himſelf? I leave it to any impartial reader to decide from theſe extracts, to which of the noble correſpondents the mean guilt of inſincerity ought apparently to be imputed.

But Lord F. it ſeems, *declined*, in the moſt

violent language, *to be the perſon to raiſe a flame in the country, which nothing ſhort of arms could be able to keep down.* The violence of this language, I confeſs myſelf unable to diſcern; the truth and the prudence of it ſtand forth ſufficiently evident. For, let me aſk the author of the *Fair Statement*, what are the objects of the preſent military preparations; for what purpoſe thirteen regiments of Fencibles have been ordered to hold themſelves in readineſs for Ireland, if ſome lurking apprehenſions do not ſtill inhabit the boſoms of miniſters; if ſome dread is not entertained that the patience and loyalty of the Catholics may, in a fatal moment of irritation, give way to their reſentment?

That ſuch were the general fears of this country, the impreſſion they made on my mind at the time ſuffers me not to forget. With what anxious expectation, but a few weeks ſince, did we watch the change of every wind,

wind, and catch the doubtful ſound of every rumour: every mail was opened with trembling ſolicitude; and every packet ſeemed freighted with the deſtiny of the empire.

That theſe fears have not been realized, may, I think, fairly be aſcribed to the merits of thoſe with whoſe hopes and wiſhes we have dared thus improvidently to ſport. I know well the diſpoſitions and the principles of the Catholics; they may complain, but they will not reſiſt; they muſt repine, but they will not, I truſt, revolt. To thoſe who have thus deeply injured their feelings, they will imitate, in their language, the deputies of Brittany to the regent Duke d'Orleans; that prince, impatient of their repeated remonſtrances againſt ſome impoſts that he had levied, petulantly exclaimed, "and what force will you oppoſe "to my decrees; and what can you do?"— "*Obey you and hate you*," replied a deputy, who, in the oppreſſion of his province, remembered

membered not the danger of his own ſituation.

It was not, however, to *extort* ſubmiſſion, it was not to be *obeyed* and *hated* that Fitzwilliam conſented to aſſume the government of Ireland. His conciliating principles, his humane diſpoſition, were ill ſuited to ſuch an adminiſtration. If any truth can be repoſed on the declarations of a man, whoſe reputation for veracity and integrity the breath of ſlander has never hitherto preſumed to ſully, he received the appointment of lord lieutenant on the expreſs condition that he ſhould be permitted to *relieve the Catholics from every remaining diſqualification*. Nor has he ever, in his letters, fallen into that ludicrous inconſiſtency with which the author of the *Fair Statement* has had the effrontery to charge him, of ſaying *that the time and manner were reſerved, and, at the ſame time, were not reſerved, to the Britiſh cabinet*; but he has conſiſtently and invariably

invariably declared, that the Britiſh cabinet were deciſive in their opinion to grant total emancipation to the Catholics: that ſome doubts remained reſpecting the proper manner and moment; and that theſe laſt conſiderations were left unreſerved to his judgment, and to the exerciſe of his diſcretion.

I have thus followed, with no inconſiderable degree of contempt, and of wearineſs, the author of the *Fair Statement*, through the ſix firſt pages of his laboured pamphlet. I have neither curtailed, eluded, nor ſoftened a ſingle charge; I have met them, I truſt, boldly and openly; and, if I do not perſevere in unravelling this web of malignity, falſehood, and party-detraction, it is from that conviction that I feel myſelf, and which I think muſt be imparted to my readers, that where, in ſuch a work, in the ſix firſt pages, not a ſentence of truth is to be diſcerned, not one accuſation is brought forward, but what is

founded on the groſſeſt miſrepreſentation, it would indeed be a waſte of time to continue this ungrateful taſk. Diſguſt and indignation cannot, on ſuch an occaſion, be entirely repreſt; but, if reſentment and the ſpirit of defamation ſhould ſtill prevail above a regard for juſtice and candour; if the *author of the Fair Statement* ſhould venture to reſume his pen, I ſhall again meet him with alacrity; I will then follow him through all the labyrinths of his ſophiſtry; I will then trace him through all the dirty and winding paths of detraction; until, ſhrinking from this dark and diſhonourable toil, he ſhall confeſs, by his ſilence,

Vane ligur, fruſtraq. animis elate ſuperbis,
Nequicquam patrias tentaſti lubricus artes.

Having expoſed the perſonal rancour, and detected the invariable falſehood, that characteriſe a pamphlet, which has aſſumed the title of the *Fair Statement*, let us next enquire what circumſtances, what appearances, ſeem

to

to juſtify the aſſertions of Lord Fitzwilliam, that neither the Catholic queſtion, nor the diſmiſſals were the ſources of his recal; but that he ſuſpects it to have originated in the early deſign of Mr. P—t to diſunite and degrade thoſe with whom he had affected to coaleſce.

It is not neceſſary in this enquiry to enter on the boundleſs ſubject of Catholic emancipation. Whatever may be the opinion of an individual like myſelf on that ſubject, the ſentiments of his majeſty's miniſters were unanimous. It had been countenanced towards the concluſion of his adminiſtration by Lord Weſtmoreland; Mr. Pitt and Dundas had been heard to declare, *that they would not riſk a rebellion in Ireland on ſuch a queſtion.* Thoſe who had ſupported the Duke of P——d when l—d l———t, were known, from their public declarations, and from their proceedings in parliament, to be the ſtrenuous ad-

vocates for this important meaſure; Mr. Grattan was correſponded with, Mr. Ponſonby was conſulted; and the only doubt that remained on the minds of the miniſters, was the propriety of immediately carrying the plan into execution.

What reaſons could influence them to defer the execution of a meaſure, which ſeems to have been recommended by the imperious neceſſity of the moment, which was evidently calculated, at a period of the moſt imminent danger, to unite againſt the common enemy all hands and all hearts; what the reaſons were which could authorize ſuch delay, I muſt acknowledge myſelf unable to comprehend. Shall I ſeek them in that procraſtination which is the refuge of weak minds? or ſhall I aſcribe them to an inſidious deſign to make Lord F———m the ſponſor of promiſes which were never meant to be kept? for who will be credulous enough to believe, that

it

it was really intended to grant, when the danger ſhould be paſt, conceſſion, which only the ſenſe of immediate embarraſſment had ſuggeſted? The weakneſs of ſuch a ſuppoſition is ſo evident, that in which ever light I view this propoſed delay, I feel no ſlight ſuſpicions of incapacity or inſincerity ariſe.

That Lord F———m was no advocate for this feeble ſyſtem of procraſtination is clear, ſince he expreſſed a wiſh that the propoſed indulgences ſhould be offered from the throne. In this wiſh he ſubmitted to be over-ruled by the opinions of his colleagues; but he ſtipulated; nor do they ſeem to have been alarmed at the ſtipulation, that if the Catholics ſhould appear determined to bring the buſineſs before parliament, that he was to give it an handſome ſupport on the part of government.

It is here, that Lord F———m and the Britiſh cabinet are at iſſue. It is true, that theſe facts reſt only on the aſſertions of his

lordſhip; but it is equally true, that they yet remain uncontroverted on the part of miniſters; and that they are fortified by a variety of circumſtances, all tending to one concluſion.

Will miniſters, I repeat, pretend that they were not acquainted with the ſentiments and proceedings of Meſſrs. Grattan and Ponſonby on the emancipation of the Catholics? Will they aſſert, that they were ignorant that Lord F———m repoſed very great confidence in the talents and judgment of thoſe gentlemen? or do they deny, that, by their conduct and language, they themſelves had contributed to create or increaſe that confidence? They will not, they cannot; it is their ſilence that Lord F———m has to dread, and not their declarations.

And what proofs have we received of the precipitancy with which it is inſinuated that the late lord lieutenant acted. On his arrival in Ireland he found the Catholics reſolved, united,

ed, and ardent; impelled to deciſion, he called to his councils thoſe with whom the cabinet had conſulted in England; he confided in the repreſentations of thoſe very men in whom Mr. P—t and the Duke of P——d had affected to confide. Mr. Grattan had long been the idol of the people, and might naturally be ſuppoſed to be acquainted with their deſires and diſpoſitions; Mr. Ponſonby had been admitted to the moſt unreſerved conferences with the Britiſh miniſters; to theſe was added the primate, who ſurely, from education and profeſſion, from rank or even from prejudice, could not be ſuſpected of inclining too ſtrongly towards the catholic party; all theſe concurred in opinion; and it was on their opinions, fortified by innumerable addreſſes from corporations, from cities and from counties, that Lord Fitzwilliam acted.

But he condeſcended not to adviſe with the old ſervants of the crown. He might indeed pro-

probably liſten with ſome warrantable diffidence to the ſuggeſtions of the chancellor, who, on a previous occaſion, had declared *that to communicate the power of a free proteſtant to a great majority of the people of Ireland, profeſſing the Popiſh religion, were an abſurd and wicked ſpeculation.* It would have been truly extraordinary had he decided on the propriety of immediately executing a meaſure, from the arguments of a man who had ſo repeatedly aſſerted, that the meaſure was in itſelf at any time wholly improper; and who, ſtanding in a ſituation which ſeemed to require the moſt moderate and decent demeanour, had long ſignalized himſelf on the ſubject by the moſt violent and intemperate language.

All was unanimity in Ireland; all was ſilence in England. In the former the plaudits of the people, were re-echoed by the Panegyrics of the parliament; in the latter,

the

the cabinet, though appriſed of every ſtep, uttered not a ſingle word of doubt, or apprehenſion; and thoſe proceedings which they refrained to cenſure, they might fairly be underſtood to approve.

But this flattering proſpect of harmony and confidence was ſoon clouded by diſtruſt and jealouſy; and on the diſmiſſals of Meſſrs. Wolfe and Toler, Meſſrs. Hamilton and Cooke, being extended to Mr. Beresford, diſcontent was firſt inſinuated, and immediately after openly avowed by the miniſter in England.

The appointment of Meſſrs. Ponſonby and Curran, and conſequently the diſmiſſals of Meſſrs. Wolfe and Toler, had been originally deſigned by the Duke of P—d, and had been concurred in by Mr. Pitt before Earl Fitzwilliam left England; nor can it be denied that the ſplendid talents of Meſſrs. Ponſonby and Curran fully juſtified ſuch an arrangement.

A noble Lord * has indeed publiſhed his diſſent to the propriety of ſuch removals; he has inſtanced the *example of men on this ſide of the water, whoſe abilities and learning would have been loſt to the ſtate, had they been driven from their ſtation, becauſe they made not the ſame brilliant figure in the ſenate, which they had done at the bar.* Alas! I too well remember the embarraſſing ſituation that his majeſty's miniſters were reduced to by the inſufficiency of the gentlemen alluded to. They roſe abaſhed and aſtoniſhed in an honeſt cauſe; their language was perplext, diſtracted, and inconſiſtent; the defence of the ſtate trials was abandoned to the manly eloquence of Mr. S——t A——r; and Mr. P—t ſuffered more that day from the imprudence and incapacity of his *official* advocates than he ever did from the ſevereſt invectives of his political opponents.

* Lord Carliſle,

Was

Was it wiſhed to expoſe Lord Fitzwilliam to the ſame embarraſſment; or to uſe his own expreſſive words, *was he to have two ſets of men, one poſſeſſing confidence without office, and the other office without confidence.*

I am ready to acknowledge the amiable qualities of Mr. H——n; and I will grant to avoid argument the indefatigable diligence of Mr. C——ke; but ſurely the diſmiſſals of the under ſecretaries in the civil and military departments, could not have excited ſuch apprehenſions in the boſoms of miniſters; was Lord Fitzwilliam daily to tranſact buſineſs with men who were known to be adverſe to the plans that he meditated; who could neither act with alacrity, nor zeal in the execution of orders which they totally diſapproved. On Mr. H——n's judgment and manners, I rely for his obeying with decency; but Mr. C—-ke muſt feel that there are men, who enflated by unmerited

proſperity, yet ſuſpicious of their own weakneſs, wiſh to conceal their want of Talents beneath a lofty, and arrogant Demeanour.

Mr. B——d ſtood indeed on different ground; he had accumulated in himſelf the various and oppoſite offices of commiſſioner of the treaſury, and of revenue, of counſel to the commiſſioners, of ſtorekeeper and of banker. His family had aſpired to all the powers of government; his brother-in-law was chancellor, his ſon-in-law treaſurer, and he had endeavoured to make his brother primate, thus graſping at the entire patronage of the church, the law and the revenue. His ambition was inſatiate, his connections formidable; and the long train of parliamentary dependents who waited on his will, might well inſpire doubt in the breaſt of a timid and intriguing viceroy; but it was not in ſuch a wretched ſchool of policy, that Lord F——m had been educated. He remembered

the

the reply of the illuſtrious Earl of Chatham, who when menaced by the late L—— E——be, with his parliamentary intereſt, boldly replied, " *I deſpiſe your aſſiſtance; and* " *while I truſt to the uprightneſs of my mea-* " *ſures for the ſupport and confidence of the* " *king, and the favour and attachment of the* " *people, I dare look in the face the proudeſt* " *connections of this country.*"

Is it then the crime of Lord F———m, that he framed himſelf on the example, and acted rather on the principles, of the father, than on thoſe of the ſon? If this indeed is his guilt, I fear years and experience will only tend to confirm it; and if converſion muſt precede reconciliation, I doubt that the enmity of Mr. P— and his lordſhip will be eternal.

Had Mr. B——d, and thoſe perſons who were known to be moſt adverſe to religious emancipation continued in office, with what conſiſtency

conſiſtency could Lord Fitzwilliam have met the petitions of the Catholics. Might not that reſpectable body have replied to his profeſſions, " How is it poſſible that we ſhould " repoſe confidence in your promiſes, when " we behold you beſet with our enemies; " when we ſee every avenue to the caſtle " guarded by countenances the moſt hoſtile " to us?" To ſuch a queſtion, I know not what anſwer Mr. P— could have ſuggeſted, but I think that it could not have been ſuch a one as would have accorded with Lord F———m's character and feelings.

Is it then to the Catholic queſtion that they had approved, or to the diſmiſſals in moſt of which they had concurred, that the miniſters will preſume to aſcribe the recal of Lord F———m? to neither; they know too well the hollow ground they ſtand upon to meet enquiry. They will wrap themſelves in myſtery and darkneſs; far from ſeeking

the

the light, they will ſedulouſly avoid it; and thus add ſtrength to thoſe jealouſies, which it is their duty, if they are able, to extinguiſh.

For with whatever contempt ſome of the cabinet, may affect to receive the charge, that it has been the early deſign of Mr. P--t to degrade and diſgrace thoſe with whom he had newly coaleſced, it is not to the boſom of Lord Fitzwilliam alone, that ſuch ſuſpicions have found admittance. Why was the blue ribband inſidiouſly thruſt on the Duke of P———d, and the diſappointment of a whole nation blended with that of Lord Howe? Why was Earl Mansfield permitted to monopolize emolument, which in ſome degree ſullied the characters of thoſe with whom he had long acted? or why has that peer whoſe exemplary virtues have propped, in ſome meaſure, the credit of a ſinking adminiſtration; who in the two laſt months has

effected

effected more to diſtreſs the common enemy, than the brother of Mr P—t could accompliſh in two years; why has ſuch a character been purſued with the moſt illiberal and ſhameleſs abuſe, by papers, known to be under the immediate controul of perſons intimately connected with government.

Is it that an under ſecretary is more dangerous to provoke in England than in Ireland? Is it that the talents of Mr B——s are ſo much more formidable than thoſe of Mr C——e? Or is it not rather, as Lord Fitzwilliam ſuſpects, the reſult of an original deſign to undermine that honour and reputation, which was neceſſary to the immediate ſupport of the miniſter; The True Briton and the Sun have teemed with thoſe coarſe attacks on Earl S——r, which have been read with mingled aſtoniſhment, and indignation; and I now find that in the Sun has been publiſhed, that tiſſue of falſehood, which has aſſumed the title of the fair ſtate-

ment. Are no inferences to be drawn from ſuch circumſtances; and are the race of Mazarines totally extinct?

I will now conclude theſe remarks, with obſerving that as blame muſt be imputed ſomewhere, it is time that the veil ſhould be removed, and that the people at large may be inſtructed to whom hereafter they can look up with juſt hope and well grounded confidence. On what ground can it be pretended that any danger can reſult from the propoſed enquiry; but it is highly neceſſary for us to learn how far Lord F———m is honeſtly entitled to that burſt of grief and admiration, which accompanied his departure from Ireland; how far Mr P— is juſtly ſubjected to thoſe imputations of intrigue and inſincerity which have attended his adminiſtration in England.———